



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,542	06/18/2001	Federico Capasso	68-107-2-21-3-37	1403

7590

08/12/2003

Michael J. Urbano
1445 Princeton Drive
Bethlehem, PA 18017-9166

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JOSEPH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,542

Applicant(s)

CAPASSO ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph Nguyen

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Capasso et al.

Regarding claim 1, Capasso et al discloses on figure 1 a heterogeneous intersubband optical device having a predetermined function, said device comprising a multiplicity of stacked intersubband optical sub devices 24 characterized in that at least two of said sub-devices 24.2, 24.3 have different individual gain/loss profiles.

The limitation “said individual gain/loss profiles are mutually adapted to generate said predetermined function” is merely functional language and therefore is not given a patentable weight.

Regarding claim 2, the claim limitation is merely product by process and therefore is not given a patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding claims 3-5, 8, the claim limitation is merely functional language and therefore is not given a patentable weight.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 9, 10, Capasso et al discloses on figure 1 all the structure set forth in the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 11, Capasso et al discloses on figure 1 a heterogeneous intersubband optical device having a predetermined gain/loss profile, said device comprising upper and lower cladding regions 12, 16, a core region 14 including a multiplicity of intersubband active regions 24 stacked between said cladding regions, each of said active regions including a plurality of radiative transition regions and interleaved therewith a plurality of injection/relaxation regions, means forming an optical cavity resonator, said active regions being located within said resonator, characterized in that at least two of said active regions are different from one another, said regions having a set of characteristic parameters including the peak energy of the ISB transitions, the energy bandwidth of said transitions, the length of said active regions and the doping levels of said regions.

The limitation "wherein said parameters are mutually adapted to generate said predetermined gain/loss profile" is merely functional language and therefore is not given a patentable weight.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 6/13/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Capasso does not disclose an ISB optical device in which a predetermined function is generated in the manner defined by the structure and function of claim 1. However, as clearly stated above in this Office Action, the limitation of "said individual gain/loss profiles are mutually adapted to generate said predetermined function" is merely functional language and therefore is not given a patentable weight. Also, applicant argues that Capasso does not disclose a multiplicity of stacked ISB optical sub-devices as cited in now amended claim 1. However, Capasso clearly discloses on figures 1-2 the active region 24 includes at least one radiative transition region 24.1, an injector-only region 24.2 and a reflector/extractor only region 24.3. As such these regions would form a multiplicity of stacked ISB optical sub-devices therein.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1269. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30 am- 4:30 pm

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7382 for regular communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JN
August 4, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eddie Lee', with a large, sweeping initial 'E'.

EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800